

IN THE CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

RA. No. 143/92 In
O.A. No. 698/92
T.A. No.

199

96

DATE OF DECISION 19-5-1992

Shri Nawab Ali & Others

Petitioners

Advocate for the Petitioner(s)

Union of India & Others

Respondent

Advocate for the Respondent(s)

CORAM

The Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, Vice-Chairman (Judl.)

The Hon'ble Mr. A.B. Gorthi, Administrative Member.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the Judgement? /M
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? /M
3. Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgement? /M
4. Whether it needs to be circulated to other Benches of the Tribunal? /M

(Judgement by Hon'ble Mr. P.K. Kartha, V.C.)

The petitioner in this R.A. is the original respondent in OA-698/92 which was disposed of by judgement dated 26.3.1992. The petitioners who had worked as Gangmen in the Northern Railway, New Delhi, had challenged the validity of the order dated 24.2.1992 issued by the respondents, whereby it had been clarified and confirmed that seniority of casual labourers who had been shifted, would remain in the Delhi Division only for the purpose of regularisation in terms of the judgement of this Tribunal dated 31.1.1992 in OA-2276/91. It had

..... 2.,

fur^other been stated that their seniority as existing in the Delhi Division, would not be disturbed in the event of shifting them to different projects outside the Delhi Division.

2. After going through the records of the case and hearing the learned counsel for both the parties, the Tribunal found no justification for quashing the impugned notice dated 24.2.1992. The respondents were, however, directed to prepare a seniority list of the casual labourers of the Delhi Division based on the length of service and in accordance with para. 5.2.1 of the Railway Board's circular dated 11.9.1986. After the seniority list is so prepared, the respondents were directed to review the cases of the petitioners who had been transferred by order dated 16.9.1991 and persons with longer service were directed to be accommodated in the Delhi Division to the extent of the availability of vacancies.

3. After going through the grounds raised in the present R.A., we see no error of law apparent on the face of our judgement. The petitioner has also not brought out any fresh facts warranting a review of the judgement. The R.A. is accordingly dismissed.

transcript
(A.B. Gorathi)
Administrative Member

arun
(P.K. Kartha)
Vice-Chairman (Judl.)